



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/773,176

02/09/2004

Shaun T. Mesher

355-8

6755

20212 7590 05/28/2010

Lambert Intellectual Property Law

Suite 200

10328 - 81 Avenue

Edmonton, AB T6E 1X2

CANADA

EXAMINER

METZMAIER, DANIEL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/28/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tony@lambertlaw.ca

t9x@shaw.ca

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/773,176	Applicant(s) MESHER ET AL.	
	Examiner Daniel S. Metzmaier	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10, 14, 16-17, 30-41, 43 and 45-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10, 14, 16-17, 30-41, 43 and 45-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 10, 14, 16-17, 30-41, 43 and 45-47 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 10, 14, 16-17, 30-41, 43 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins, US 4,737,296, in view of Munoz, Jr. et al, US PG PUB 20030078180, and Jennings, Jr., US 4,807,703.

Watkins (column 7, lines 33-36; column 8, lines 6-10, 26-32, 51-52, 66 to column 9, line 1; column 9, lines 45) discloses the formation of acid-containing foams for the purpose of cleaning scale out of conduits. Watkins (column 7, line 36) clearly contemplates mixtures of solvents.

Watkins (column 8, lines 6 et seq) clearly contemplates alcohols, esters and ketones as claimed.

Watkins differs from the claims in the use of a particular combination of solvents, the further use of a cyclic ether, e.g., tetrahydrofuran and the concentrations thereof.

Watkins (column 7, lines 33-36; column 8, lines 6-10, 26-32, 51-52, 66 to column 9, line 1) contemplates mixtures of solvents including those instantly claimed. Watkins (example 16) discloses the use of MEK at about 22 vol% and about 74 vol% acid. The

vol% is referenced for simplicity and the wt% of the materials would not vary dramatically therefrom since the materials would have been expected to have specific gravities of about 1.

Munoz, Jr. et al discloses aqueous acid foaming compositions comprising (paragraph [0032] and claim 8) mutual solvents including alcohols, esters, ketones (e.g., MEK) and cyclic ethers (e.g., THF) at concentrations of 1 to 50 wt % of the foamer composition. Munoz, Jr. et al further teaches solvent combinations.

Jennings, Jr (abstract and column 1, lines 1 et seq; column 3, lines 9-36) discloses foamable acid treating compositions comprising alcohols, esters, ketones (e.g., MEK) and cyclic ethers (e.g., THF).

It is generally *prima facie* obvious to use in combination two or more ingredients that have previously been used separately for the same purpose in order to form a third composition useful for that same purpose. In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980); In re Pinten, 459 F.2d 1053, 173 USPQ 801 (CCPA 1972); In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); In re Crockett, 279 F.2d 274, 126 USPQ 186 (CCPA 1960). As stated in Kerkhoven and Crockett, the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. In the instant case, the ester, ether, and alcohol solvents are all taught for the same function as a mutual solvent of the oil and water. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to employ the mixtures in an acid-containing composition for the advantage of matching the solvent system to the system, e.g., sludge and scale, being treated.

The specification does not provide a showing of criticality of the particular solvents and each is specifically recited in the Watkins, Munoz, Jr. et al, and Jennings, Jr references.

Since Watkins (column 8, lines 6 et seq) clearly contemplates the instantly claimed alcohols, esters and ketones in various concentrations and the properties of said solvents are well known, it is reasonable and would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan to employ the solvents in mixtures at varied concentrations in the absence of unobvious and/or criticality of the particular concentrations.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 04 August 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, 14, 16-17, 30-41, 43 and 45-47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
5. Applicants assert the THF is not disclosed in Watkins. As shown above, THF as well as other cyclic ethers were well known as useful as a solvent in acidizing foams, which Watkins is directed. Applicants do not point out how the claims otherwise distinguish over the art.
6. The allowable subject matter has been withdrawn since the claims have been amended to broaden their scope beyond that, which was indicated as allowable. Said claims are deemed to be *prima facie* obvious in the absence of evidence of unobviousness since all the solvents were known as a solvent system in acid foams.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel S. Metzmaier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1089. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**/Daniel S. Metzmaier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796**

DSM